

amounts of money paid to these officials allow these criminals to traffic people and drugs into our land.

There is a huge difference in the size and scope of these international criminal activities and the typical domestic law enforcement agencies and their duties. As more and more of the violence spills over into Texas and other border States, there is an urgent need to get this lawlessness under control.

The cost of this culture of crime is hammering border States. The FBI is stretched too thin, they don't have the manpower to address this cross-border corruption, and they are fighting domestic Federal crime and jihadists.

Right now we are asking local sheriffs in border States to do double duty, as if they are agents of Interpol. Our domestic police forces should be freed up to do what they do best, fight crime in their counties and their communities.

Our Drug Enforcement Agency is doing a noble effort to control these international criminal cartels that more and more resemble an army at the border than the Cosa Nostra, but the FBI has not been given enough American resources. The Border Patrol is overrun, outmanned, and outgunned.

Our government has limited their rules of engagement. Their standard operating procedure is nonconfrontational. Heavily armed bad guys come through with their contraband of drugs and humans, and yet little is done when they confront our Border Patrol. These cartels are made up of a hybrid of many of the worst elements of organized crime. They include terrorist cells, international espionage agencies, and a foreign military.

But why are we acting as if we can no longer defend our borders and citizens from this lawlessness? It is the philosophy of some that we should wave the white flag of surrender and lessen, not strengthen, our border security. This is absolute nonsense. The Mexican organized criminal cartels are sophisticated, and they are deadly. Maybe it is time to put the United States military on the border. There is no higher duty for the American military than to protect the borders of its own Nation from international criminal invasion.

It is interesting, Madam Speaker. We use our military thousands of miles away to fight the drug war in Afghanistan, but we won't use them at home. Why not? There is no answer from the administration.

We should rotate deployments of our military to the southern border. Our brave men and women are routinely deployed for desert training. Why not concentrate these deployments on the border? This frees up our domestic law enforcement to do the job they should be doing, which is rooting out corruption on our side of the border.

Madam Speaker, I have flown with the National Guard along the Texas-Mexico border. They do a tremendous job working with the Border Patrol and the DEA. But a handful of helicopters

is not enough to secure the border. The Air National Guard needs more equipment, more money and more troops to capture the outlaw cartel gangs. The U.S. gave Mexico \$1.5 billion to fight the cartels. That money should have been given to our border protectors, not the culture of corruption on the Mexican side of the border.

A lot of attention has been rightly focused on our southern border over the past few years. We have increased the boots on the ground, installed some cameras and erected some barriers and fences and sensors. The efforts have not sealed the border, however.

As the violence gets worse in Mexico, we must get a border strategy in place now before it erupts into a level of widespread violence and more corruption that engulfs our own citizens.

It is not going away, Madam Speaker. The drug cartels are in it for the long haul because of their lust for money. There is a war against drugs going on on the border, even though we are told now that we should not, because of political correctness, use that term.

The first duty of government is to protect the people. The government needs to focus on border protection. Meanwhile, the border war continues.

And that's just the way it is.

ENDING MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the supplemental appropriations bill to continue our military operations in Iraq and in Afghanistan will soon return to the House for another vote. I voted against it in the first place, and I am going to vote against it again. I cannot support it because it will prolong our military involvement in Iraq and it will increase our military buildup in Afghanistan.

I would gladly vote to fund the safe withdrawal of our troops and contractors out of Iraq. But the supplemental gives me a feeling of *deja vu*. Haven't we been there before, voting to include billions of dollars for the occupation of Iraq?

Congress has voted to increase funding for Iraq many times, even though the American people want the occupation to end, and it seems the Iraqi people want us out of their country as well.

The supplemental also calls for sending more troops to a foreign land, this time Afghanistan, with no exit strategy. Talk about repeating past mistakes. Talk about *deja vu*. Afghanistan feels exactly the same as Iraq did to me.

President Obama has said that a campaign against extremism will not succeed with bullets and bombs alone. He is absolutely correct about that. But the money in the supplemental is

overwhelmingly devoted to military operations. It includes very little for the economic development, humanitarian aid, and diplomatic efforts that we really need to stop extremists in Afghanistan and in Pakistan.

The ratio is 90-10, 90 percent to the Department of Defense, 10 percent to the smart alternatives. I believe the supplemental also violates the spirit of President Obama's historic speech in Cairo where he offered the Muslim world the hand of friendship. In that speech he said that we must leave Iraq to the Iraqis. But the supplemental will only delay the return of sovereignty to the Iraqi people.

And then there is the little matter of the recession, Madam Speaker. When the American people are feeling such great pain and need so much help right here at home, we can't afford to squander another \$100 billion on foreign military adventures that will not make our country safe.

□ 1300

Instead of approving the supplemental bill, the House should be urging the administration to fundamentally change our mission in Iraq, and our mission in Afghanistan. We can do this in several ways.

First, we should support the bill offered by JIM MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, which calls upon the administration to submit an exit strategy for Afghanistan.

Second, I urge my colleagues to consider the plan that I have offered in House Resolution 363. It's called the Smart Security Platform For the 21st Century. Smart Security attacks the root causes of violence by fighting poverty and giving people hope for a better future. It controls the spread of nuclear and conventional weapons of mass destruction, and it strengthens our national security by reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

And finally, we should insist that at least 80 percent of all future funding for Afghanistan be devoted to the Smart Security I just described. Right now, the supplemental, as I told you, devotes more than 90 percent of its dollars to purely military efforts, efforts that are getting us nowhere.

Madam Speaker, we must not repeat the mistakes of the past. We've got to stop writing more blank checks for open-ended occupations. This is what the American people want, and Congress must listen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)